

|   |                                      |                                      |  |
|---|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>09/815,983 | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>JENSON ET AL. |  |
|   | <b>Examiner</b><br>Bruce F. Bell     | <b>Art Unit</b><br>1746              |  |

**All Participants:**

(1) Bruce F. Bell.

(2) Mr. Charles LeMaire.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 1 September 2006

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*none*

Claims discussed:

*claims 1, 9, 37, 38, 63-66, 80 and 125*

Prior art documents discussed:

*Goldner et al*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Discussed example 2 of Goldner which shows an electrolyte deposition of 2000 angstroms and discussed that applicants had support in their instant specification for less than 1000 angstroms. Mr. LeMaire agreed to change the claims to read over the prior art of Goldner et al..